

lord who farms with tenants, the absentee landlord who lives in the city and farms over long-distance, the time merchant who furnishes the farmer with supplies and credit for producing his crops, and oftentimes the banker who furnishes the capital for the whole community—are, on the whole, engaged in one of the least prosperous industries in the State. There has been little profit made by the farmers in many sections of the State this year. In fact, in the east, that is, the Coastal Plain region, it has been represented that this winter there is actual want among some tenant farmers and croppers. While the east itself has refuted this assertion, it is nevertheless true that agriculture in 1929 was engaged in without profit in some sections and by many individual farmers.

Agriculture Not Prosperous in the Nation

What is the cause of this? Of course, the school children of the State know that the condition of agriculture today presents a serious problem throughout the nation. In general, agriculture of late years has not been prosperous. In the great Middle West, on the Pacific coast, and in the South, which are the principal farming sections of the nation, the farmers, speaking broadly, have not made money. The problem of increasing the prosperity of agriculture is by many thought to be the biggest problem confronting the Federal government today. Last year Congress created the Federal Farm Board, an organization set up to aid President Hoover's administration and the United States Department of Agriculture in stimulating agricultural prosperity throughout the nation. This board will have \$500,000,000 to be lent to the farmers and to be used in the marketing of farm products so as to increase the profits from agriculture to the farmers.

Why Agriculture is Not Prosperous in North Carolina

The agricultural problem is certainly a serious one in this State. It is receiving the most careful thought of the present State administration. In my opinion, one reason why agriculture in North Carolina is not returning a satisfactory profit is that our farmers devote practically all their time to the growing of crops, to the exclusion of growing livestock and livestock products. Our farmers not only put their main reliance in crops; they put most of their work and sink most of their annual investment in growing *crops for sale*—cash crops. Out of the total annual agricultural output of nearly \$400,000,000, something like \$325,000,000 is derived from crops; \$75,000,000, or less, from livestock and livestock products. Stated differently, the average annual crop value per farm during the past five years, 1924 to 1928, is \$1,034, and the annual livestock production is only \$276 per farm.

The extent to which our complete dependence is put upon our two principal cash crops, tobacco and cotton, is borne in upon us by the fact that they combined represent some two-thirds of the value of the total crops grown in the State. The average value of the tobacco crop is approximately \$100,000,000 per year, and of the cotton crop \$90,000,000.

The live-at-home idea would supplement these cash crops with more consumption of food-and-feed crops; and it would supplement crop farming itself with a larger amount of livestock and livestock products. The reason why such change is so important to the State is that recently the margin